REMARKS

[0001] Claims 1-5, 13, 18, and 19 remain in the case and stand rejected. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 18 and 19 were objected to for informalities. Claims 13, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as also being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph for lack of support. Claims 1-5, 13, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hesmer et al., "Portlet Development Guide" Edition 1.1, pp 1-59, January 30, 2002 (hereinafter "Hesmer").

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

[0002] Applicants have cancelled Claims 13, 18, and 19 to direct the application exclusively to method claims. Applicants reserve the right to pursue these canceled claims in a continuation application.

[0003] In this Amendment, Applicants have cancelled Claims 13, 18, and 19 from further consideration in this application. Applicants request that these amendments be entered. Applicants submit the enclosed amendments to cancel non-method claims and to the title and parts of the specification body to conform to the type of claims remaining.

[0004] Claim 1 was amended to clarify embodiments of the invention. This amendment will be addressed in relation to the corresponding rejection. Furthermore, Claims 2-5 were amended to be consistent with the amendment to Claim 1.

[0005] Claims 20 and 21 were added. Support for these claims may be found in ¶ [0119] ("multiple portlets in a given portlet application will have independent user sessions . . . but share the same Portlet Application Session") and ¶ [0144] (describing how portlets may belong to more than one dynamic context group (collaboration group).

[0006] Applicants are not conceding in this application that the claims amended or cancelled are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications. No new matter has been added.

OBJECTION TO CLAIMS 18 AND 19

[0007] The Office Action objected to Claims 18 and 19 for informalities. Specifically, Claim 18 refers to non-elected Claims 6-11 and Claim 19 refers to non-elected Claims 12 and 14-17. However, Claims 18 and 19 have been cancelled. Therefore, the objection is moot.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 13 AND 18-19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101 AND 18-19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

[0001] The Office Action rejected Claims 13 and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claim 13 is rejected for claiming a "portlet application" which may be interpreted as a program per se.

[0002] In addition, the Office Action rejected Claims 18-19, which claims "a computer readable signal bearing medium" also as software *per se*. Related to this rejection, the Office Action rejected Claims 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph as lacking support by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility and because one skilled in the art would not know how to use the invention.

[0003] However, as these claims have been cancelled, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 101 are moot.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-5 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

[0004] Claims 1-5, 13, 18 and 19 (now 1-5) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hesmer. "Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires the disclosure in a

single piece of prior art of each and every limitation of a claimed invention. …Whether such art is anticipating is a question of fact." *Apple Computer, Inc. v. Articulate Systems, Inc.*, 234 F.3d 14, 20, 57 USPQ2d 1057, 1061 (Fed. Cir. 2000). It is well settled that under 35 U.S.C. §102 "an invention is anticipated if . . . all the claim limitations [are] shown in a single art prior art reference. Every element of the claimed invention must be literally present, arranged as in the claim. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the patent claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., Ltd.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

[0005] Hesmer is a guide to portlet development. As such, Hesmer seems to describe deployment descriptors, Hesmer 2.4, portlet applications which form logical groups of portlets, *id.* 2.1, portlet context name/value pairs, *id.* at 3.6, and PortletSessions, created for each portlet on a page, *id.* at 3.7.

[0006] Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 clearly recites features not taught or suggested in Hesmer Claim 1 as amended states:

> 1. (Currently Amended) A method of collaboration between a plurality of
> associated portlets in a portal server comprising:
>> defining a **common Portlet Application Session Object**, the Portlet
>>> Application Session Object comprising a data store session object
>>> and configured to **allow each portlet in a portlet application to
>>> share session information;**
>> associating each portlet in a portlet application with a portlet descriptor
>>> describing a **dynamic** context name, each portlet configured to
>>> access the common Portlet Application Session Object, the
>>> dynamic context name **referencing a dynamic context
>>> configured to be changed during runtime; and**
>> forming collaboration groups of portlets having corresponding dynamic
>>> context names, **a collaboration group being a subgroup of the
>>> group of portlets** in a the portlet application, the portlets in each
>>> collaboration group **sharing dynamic context changes through
>>> the Portlet Application Session Object**.

-8-

[0007] The amendments to Claim 1 are fully supported by the Specification in at least ¶¶ [0119], [0174]-[0177] (describing a Portlet Application Session Object) and [0144], [0189]-[0215] (describing a dynamic context group).

[0008] Hesmer does not teach "defining a **common Portlet Application Session Object, the Portlet Application Session Object comprising a data store session object and configured to allow each portlet in a portlet application to share session information**." Hesmer seems to teach a PortletSession, which holds "user-specific data for the virtual instance of the portlet." Hesmer, sec. 3.7, p. 21. However, a PortletSession is created for each portlet and is not common to all portlets in a portlet application as recited in Claim 1. A Portlet Application Session Object common to the portlets of a portlet application allows the portlets to share session information.

[0009] Therefore, Hesmer fails to teach "defining a common Portlet Application Session Object, the Portlet Application Session Object comprising a data store session object and configured to allow each portlet in a portlet application to share session information."

[0010] Additionally, Hesmer fails to teach "a **dynamic** context name" that "**referenc[es] a dynamic context configured to be changed during runtime.**" Hesmer appears to teach a "Portlet Context" which allows a portlet to access context parameters common to all portlets in the application, use portlet services, or access the portlet log. *Id.* at sec 3.6, p. 19. Hesmer includes an example of a context parameter: a context parameter called "Webmaster" that corresponds to the portal site administrator's email address. *Id.* at sec 3.6, p. 19, "Attributes." Therefore, any portlet could reference the email address. *Id.* However, Hesmer merely describes the standard Portlet Context and fails to teach a *dynamic* portlet context that may be changed during runtime. For example, if portlet OrderedItems receives an HTTP request with attribute itemName set to "PentiumIV," OrderedItems sets the name/value pair corresponding to the dynamic context in the requests object of OrderedItems. Other portlets such as an Instock portlet

or UPStracking portlet are notified and can take appropriate actions based on the itemName. *See* Specification, ¶¶ [0215], [0235].

[0011] Therefore, Hesmer fails to teach "a dynamic context name" that "referenc[es] a dynamic context configured to be changed during runtime."

[0012] Hesmer does not teach "**a collaboration group being a subgroup of the group of portlets**" and "the portlets in each collaboration group **sharing dynamic context changes through the Portlet Application Session Object**." While Hesmer appears to teach a portlet application, which is a group of portlets. Hesmer fails to teach any concept of a subgroup of portlets in a portlet group. Furthermore, Hesmer also fails to teach a dynamic context as previously stated and therefore also fails to teach the sharing of dynamic context changes. The use of a dynamic context allows portlets in the same collaborative group to be alerted as to context changes. For example, in a portlet application with bank account listings, selecting a different account from the account list in one portlet allows another portlet to display invoice information from the account selected. *See* Specification, ¶ [0201]. Another example illustrates the functionality of the dynamic context: if portlet OrderedItems receives an HTTP request with attribute itemName set to "PentiumIV," OrderedItems sends the dynamic context (name/value pair) to the portlets UPSTracking and InStockInventory notifying them that context itemName with value "PentiumIV" was now set in the dynamic context. *See* Specification, ¶¶ [0214], [0215], [0234].

[0013] Therefore, Hesmer fails to teach "a collaboration group being a subgroup of the group of portlets" and "the portlets in each collaboration group sharing dynamic context changes through the Portlet Application Session Object."

[0014] Because Hesmer does not teach "defining a common Portlet Application Session Object, the Portlet Application Session Object comprising a data store session object and configured to allow each portlet in a portlet application to share session information," "a dynamic context name" that "referenc[es] a dynamic context configured to be changed during runtime," "a collaboration group being a subgroup of the group of portlets" and "the portlets in each collaboration group sharing dynamic context changes through the Portlet Application Session Object," Hesmer does not anticipate Claim 1.

[0015] Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of amended Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. Furthermore, Claims 2-5 depend from independent claims that are allowable, as described above. *See In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Consequently Applicant requests that the rejection of dependent Claims 2-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

[0016] In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for immediate allowance. In the event any questions or issues remain that can be resolved with a supplemental phone call, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate a telephone conference with the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 15, 2008
8 East Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Telephone (801) 994-4646

 / David J. McKenzie /
David J. McKenzie
Reg. No. 46,919
Attorney for Applicants

-11-